

.REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 50-113 are pending in the application. Claims 50, 51, 53-62, 64, 66-71, 73-77, 83, and 85-113 are allowed, and claims 52, 63, 65, 72, 78-82, and 84 are objected to. Reconsideration of claims 52, 63, 65, 72, 78-82, and 84 is requested in light of the foregoing amendment.

Claim Amendments

The foregoing amendment substitutes “when” for “if in each of claims 52, 63, 72, and 78, as suggested by the Examiner. In addition, claim 65 is amended to substitute “that is at least one of owned and operated” for “owned and/or operated”; claim 81 is amended to substitute “printer that recreates” for “printer adapted for recreating”; and claim 84 is amended to substitute “printer recreates” for “printer is capable of recreating”. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification and in the claims, and no new matter is added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 52, 63, 65, 72, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Examiner objects to use of the term “if” in claims 52, 63, 72 and at least 78-80. It is noted that the term “if” is not found in either of claims 79 or 80, and a global search of the claims does not disclose the term “if” in any of the remaining claims in the application. Thus, it is believed that the foregoing amendment substituting “when” for “if” in each of claims 52, 63, 72, and 78, as suggested by the Examiner, overcomes the rejection.

The Examiner further objects to the use of “and/or” in claim 65. It is believed that the foregoing amendment of claim 65 substituting “that is at least one of owned and operated” for “owned and/or operated” overcomes the rejection.

The Examiner also objects to use of "adapted for" language in claims 81, 82 and 84. It is noted that the term "adapted for" is not found in either of claims 82 or 84, although the term "capable of" is found in claim 84. It is believed that the foregoing amendment of claim 81 substituting "printer that recreates" for "printer adapted for recreating" and the amendment of claim 84 substituting "printer recreates" for "printer is capable of recreating" overcomes the rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner's statement that claims 50, 51, 53-62, 64, 66-71, 73-77, 83, and 85-113 are allowed and that claims 52, 63, 65, 72, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 84 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims is noted.

It is believed that the foregoing amendment of claims 52, 63, 72, and 78, as suggested by the Examiner, and the further amendment of claims 65, 81 and 84, fully overcomes the rejection and addresses the objection and that claims 52, 63, 65, 72, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84 are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and these remarks, each of the claims remaining in the application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection and to pass the application to issue. The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned at 704-503-2579 to discuss any questions relating to the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 10, 2010
King & Spalding LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006-4706
(202) 737-0500

By: John M. Harrington - Reg 25,592/
John M. Harrington (Reg. No. 25,592)